



OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE



An Extemporaneous Talk by
ALLEN A. ZOLL
Executive Vice-President
National Council for American Education


Before the 20th National and 9th International
Convention of
ZETA TAU ALPHA



At THE GRAND HOTEL
Mackinac Island, Michigan



JULY 2, 1950



OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

By ALLEN A. ZOLL

Executive Vice-President

National Council for American Education

MADAM President and Members of Zeta Tau Alpha: As is customary on these occasions, may I tell you that it is a pleasure and an honor to be here. It really is an honor and it is a great pleasure as well, but I feel somewhat like the Duke of Wellington did just before the Battle of Waterloo when he summoned all of his generals to brief them on their conduct for the day of the battle. He looked them over and said, "Gentlemen, I don't know how you will impress the enemy, but, frankly, you terrify me." (Laughter)

Enroute here a ZTA on the train said to me, "Please make your talk funny," so I start off with a story, and that makes the average about right, because the rest of the things that I have to tell you are deadly serious. These are perilous times in which we are living, though I don't know whether you have realized it or not.

If I may give you a brief autobiography, I have been in this work for over thirty years. Since before anybody else in this room was even alive (Laughter) I have been fighting this spectre of what ails our country. After World War I, I attended one of Harvard's graduate schools—under my own G.I. Bill of Rights, by the way. You did not think I am old enough to have been in World War I, but I am—I hope you didn't think that is. (Laughter) I roomed there with a boy whose father had been governor of Arkansas. We were quite interested in politics and we went to a number of political meetings on the campus. I had my eyes opened then—30 years ago—to what the subversive forces of this universe were trying to do in our schools and colleges.

We went to numbers of meetings of apparently innocuous organizations. One group was called the John Reed Club. Well, John Reed sounds like a good American name; I did not know until afterward that John Reed was the first American Communist. He was such a good Communist that when he died he was buried in the wall of the Kremlin right behind Lenin's tomb. I also attended a number of meetings of the Intercollegiate Socialist League. Those organizations under various names are still going on today, in our colleges, in *your* colleges. They have changed their names from time to time. By the way, if I mention any names here of organizations to which you belong, I am one of those who rush in where angels fear to tread, so think nothing of it.

Frankly, young ladies, the situation in our colleges is tragic and I am going to try to point out to you this afternoon some of the things that are going on in the very sincere hope—this being Sunday I might even offer a little prayer—that you will become aware of them, if you are not already, and that you will do your dead level best to preserve the great heritage that was handed down to us by our forefathers. We of my generation are not going to be able to carry on the fight much longer, and it is up to you young people to see that the things that you have inherited—the fine heritage that is the United States of America—will be handed down to your children and grandchildren.

I want to talk to you for a few minutes about the ideologies which I consider constitute great threats to the freedom of America. Very largely these stem from and through the schools and colleges.

One of the great threats with which we are faced today is, first of all, the threat of International Communism. You have heard a lot about Communism in the last few years. Thank God that the American people have begun to awaken to the menace that is Communism! A few years ago that was not the case, but today we have even the labor unions kicking out the Communist unions and Communist-dominated unions. However, Communism still is a very grave menace; the chief reason for this is that the Communists have been smart enough and farsighted enough to infiltrate the places in our economy where opinion is molded.

This situation is so bad today that it is almost impossible to get published a "Right Wing" book; it is almost impossible to hear "Right Wing" radio commentators. There are only four or five on all the air waves, and over fifty of the other kind.

The editorial boards of almost all magazines are dominated by these people, who have made it their business to get into the key points where they can control the thinking of Americans.

They are in our churches. I happen to be a Presbyterian so I can speak freely when I say that the Protestant churches are very serious offenders. It is possible that the reason they are, and the thing which has caused our schools to be the way they have become, has been the indoctrination the leaders have gotten in their theological seminaries and normal schools. It may seem unbelievable when I say that it is in our normal schools and theological seminaries that the seeds of Communism are planted, but, unfortunately, it is quite true. The enemies of Liberty have been farsighted enough and smart enough to plant their agents in those key places.

Please do not think that I am just a frightener of little girls when I talk about the menaces that exist in the country. I assure you they are very real, and perhaps at this wonderful ZETA TAU ALPHA convention you will have your eyes opened to some of the things that are going on right on your campuses, and possibly you will be able to take steps to do something about them.

I said that there are three menaces—one is Communism, and thank goodness, that is today not such a great menace as it was a few years ago, mainly because many people have had their eyes opened.

A second menace and one very similar to Communism is that of Socialism. For a great many years it has been "smart" to be a Socialist. The "very best people" were Socialists. College professors who were not Socialists just did not rate. Today, in my opinion, Socialism is a much greater menace than Communism, because the American people have not yet had their eyes opened to the menace that Socialism—"Planned Economy"—constitutes to our liberties, to our freedom and to the freedom of our grandchildren.

England has within the last few years come into a very dire state because the British people did not realize in time what was happening. Pray God that Americans will awake in time, and will stop the things that are steps in the direction of socializing our country.

One trouble with Americans is that we oppose the specific things that hurt us in our own lives or pockets, without concerning ourselves with other activities which are all part of the same pattern. For instance, some of you may be doctors' wives or doctors' daughters. Most doctors are opposed to socialized medicine, as they jolly well should be, but they don't see socialized medicine as just one segment of this whole pattern of Socialism. They may, for example, be very much in favor of the Brannan Plan, because that does not affect them, or approve of federal aid to education, because that sounds like a fine idea, or they may favor social security—but they are opposed to socialized medicine because it affects *them*. Those are all bricks in the same Socialist road, and you cannot be opposed to one and in favor of the others on principle, if you know what the principle is. Briefly I am going to outline, if I may, some of the bricks on the road to Socialism.

There are two great theories of Government, and only two. One is that the State is supreme, and the other is that the individual is supreme. For the purpose of making this clear, let's call the one Statism and the other Individualism. Over the period of history they have been called by a great

variety of names, but those pretty well, I think, express the thoughts that are inherent in each of the philosophies.

The philosophy of Individualism is almost verbatim expressed in our magnificent Declaration of Independence, the birthday of which we celebrate the day after tomorrow. That is the greatest document on Individualism that has ever been written. I firmly and sincerely believe that the hand of God had something to do with the writing of that Declaration. It magnificently sets forth the principles of the freedom of the individual: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable *Rights*, . . ." (rights *endowed by their Creator*, not given by some super state) ". . . that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness; that to secure these *rights*, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." And that is the crux of the whole matter, that all rights reside in the individual except those that are granted by the individual to the State.

That was in 1776, as you know. Let's go back 1776 years before that to the birth of Christ. We can cover this in just a couple of minutes, so don't get too nervous. The coming of the Christian Era brought for the first time in all history the new revolutionary idea that man is an individual being with a soul of his own, and with the dignity of being a son of God. For thousands of years before that, man had been the servant or the slave—of the tribal chieftain, or the king, or some of the other governing types of which we know very little. Even from that time on for hundreds of years, with a few exceptions, man was still the creature of the tribal chieftain, or the king, or the aristocracy, or the nobility, or the state. He was a slave, or a feudal servant of the ruler or the state, and the ruler or the state could take his life, his property, his sons, his daughters, any or all of his possessions at will.

There had been moments prior to 1776 when people had begun to question whether or not it was right for the ruler or the state to have such absolute power. The Magna Charta, wrested by his nobles from King John in 1215, touched on some of these things, but our Declaration was the first time they had ever been set down specifically in black on white, and is the first time that a nation was founded upon the all-important doctrine that all rights are vested in the individual.

Under Statism the state has supreme authority. Any rights the individual may temporarily exercise are his only by permission of the state. These

permitted rights may be canceled at pleasure by the state, and from the cradle to the grave all men owe obedience and complete allegiance to the state.

This all may seem a bit abstruse, theoretical and pointless. It is not, because the whole theory of human relationships and the relationship of any political body to the individual is based upon this one point: Is man the master, or is the state the master? Is the individual supreme, or is the state supreme? Under every form of totalitarian government—Communist, Socialist, Fascist, Nazi, or what not—the state is supreme, and the individual has no rights except those that are granted temporarily by the state and which can be taken away at any time by the state.

If you will bear in mind that one distinction and ask yourself this question when various measures are proposed, automatically you will know the right answer. "Does this detract from the freedom of the individual and give more power to the state?" If it does, it is another step on the road to Socialism—and America is already pretty far down that road.

You have heard a lot about Liberalism, about Liberals. Many people throw out their chests and say, "I am a Liberal! Communists are way over to the Left, something else is way over to the Right, but *me*, I am a Liberal!" You probably have heard the definition that a Radical is anybody to your Left and a Fascist is anybody to your Right.

Here is one thing the left wingers have done: For a long time they have appropriated to themselves words that mean great things. For instance, they today are the Liberals, they say, and that is one of the greatest thefts in history. The word *liberal*, as you students of Latin know, is from the same root as the word *liberty*; it means the same thing. And for these people who would take America down the path to totalitarianism by again putting the individual under the absolute control of the state—which is what every one of the self-proclaimed *liberals* want to do—for those people to call themselves liberal—is theft, grand larceny, of one of our great words. A real liberal is a person who stands for the liberty of the individual—the thing for which your ancestors fought in the American Revolution, and the thing in which your parents believe, and I hope you do.

Progressives, they call them, when they want to take us backward—to statism, serfdom, slavery. For thousands of years we have been fighting our way upward from slavery, slowly, little by little. We have been progressing ever upward since the birth of Christ—until we finally achieved liberty in this country. But they call themselves *progressive* now, when they want to stop that upward

trend, and take us back to the point where we were in the Middle Ages, where the state was supreme.

Therefore, when you hear one say that he is a Liberal or a Progressive, you can ask yourself, "Is he a true Liberal, a true Progressive, or does he want to put us under a totalitarian, all-powerful state?"

I said awhile ago that England is in a very sad situation. It is. You young ladies probably have not yet had much concern over income taxes, except that if your fathers did not have to pay so much income tax to the government, they could probably give more to you. But did you know that the income tax in England is 130 per cent for those in the high income brackets? "How could anybody be taxed 130 per cent?" you say. It is done because the Socialist government wants to take away capital from everybody—and they are doing it. That is Statism gone rampant. It is bad enough when the government simply controls the steel mills or the coal mines or the railroads or the banks or other industries, but when they interfere with the lives of individuals, as is being done tremendously in England and as they are starting to do in this country, that is assuredly not liberty.

The Declaration of Independence was not just a declaration of independence from England; it was far more than that. It was also a declaration of freedom, of individualism, of the end of Statism in these United States.

Because of the fact that we Americans have not been alert, and because the Socialist termites have been smarter, have worked harder—freedom of the individual as we have known it is today in grave jeopardy.

And they do work harder. For instance, there was a young G.I. who last year came to Wayne University in Detroit from the West Coast. This boy who had been an active Communist decided that he was fed up with the Communists, and approached the F.B.I., asking them if they would like for him to renew his contacts with the Party and report to them. The F.B.I., which is always glad to have sincere people reporting to it on what is going on in various organizations or on college campuses, said, "Yes, indeed!" So he rejoined the Communist Party in Michigan and reported to the F.B.I. everything that took place at all the meetings—who was there, what they said, and so on. Finally he got tired of that and told the F.B.I. that he was going to get out of it, and he did so. Then he got a part-time job about which he said a most significant thing: That as long as he was a Communist he did not have time to take

a job because the Communists kept him too busy working for the Party. And they *did*, and they *do*.

The Communists and Socialists and all those who seek to take away from us our liberty are zealots. Most of us are not—unfortunately. We are easy-going, carefree. But I tell you that these people who are seeking to take away your liberties and your children's liberties are working at it fanatically, eighteen to twenty hours a day, seven days a week. They are well organized and they are making great progress, I am sorry to report.

I want to talk to you about the situation on your campus, if I may, and I mean *yours* only in a general sense. One of the first things the enemies of America tried to do was to infiltrate our college campuses, and they have been doing it successfully, adroitly and effectively ever since. I doubt if there is a college campus in the United States that does not have one or more very assiduous "radical cells."

I am not going to differentiate between Socialists and Communists in this connection, because basically they are the same and their ultimate goals are identical. As you know, the Russian Government is really Socialist. Its official name is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As a matter of fact, they are not Communists at all, because nobody owns anything, which they would if it were a real commune. No one, except the fifteen tyrants who sit at the top, has anything to say about anything, so that is not communal. Earl Browder before the Un-American Activities Committee, not very long ago, said that the aims of the Socialist regime and the Communist regime are identical, as they are. Someone well said that "Communists are merely Socialists in a hurry." They want to get there by violent revolution, by fire and sword. Socialists are willing to take a little longer about it and use the ballot and more general education.

Both of these groups—Communists and Socialists—are on your campus.

Here are some of the ways you can recognize them:

(1) One identifying mark is that they are the ones who are out against "discrimination," and that is one of their great rallying cries.

That makes me sound like a real discriminator, doesn't it? Well, what is wrong with discrimination? Discrimination means to choose, and the fact that you chose to come to this splendid convention shows that you are discriminating. You had a choice either to come or not to come, and you chose to come. Freedom of choice is, thank God, one of the great freedoms that we have in this country, still. And if you choose to belong to this

fraternity instead of some other, like the Pi Phi or Tri Delt or some other . . . (Laughter) . . . you have that choice, and that is one of the great freedoms that is still permitted to us.

When they telephone your fraternity on the campus—as I presume they do, for they do it on all the campuses—and in a nasty, sneering voice say, “Do you have discrimination in your chapter?” don’t get upset about it. Tell them “Certainly we are discriminating; we invite whom we want to join, and that is still a privilege of Americans.”

And let me tell you a secret. There are a lot of their organizations to which *you* cannot belong. They discriminate all over the place to keep out such as you, and yet they sneer and throw bricks and call you nasty names because you don’t let some of them in. If we cannot associate with people with whom we like to associate, it is just too bad.

Please get me straight. I do not believe in keeping any group in squalor or in miserable surroundings; but I do believe that if a person wants to belong to a boat club or a golf club or a fraternity and associate with people of his own general group, that is his or her business and nobody else’s. And if you want to patronize a hotel that limits its guests to people like you, what of it?

Continually sounding off about discrimination is one of the earmarks by which you can spot them.

(2) Another sign is that they call themselves “Liberal.” If you are like me or even one-tenth like me, they will probably call you a Fascist or a Nazi. But *they* are *Liberals*—and when they throw out their chests and talk about how liberal and progressive they are, you can recognize that as another danger sign—and there are a lot of others.

(3) Another indication is activity in Communist-front organizations. The National Council for American Education, with which I do much work, has made reports on a number of universities, showing the Communist-front affiliations of some of the professors. The first report was on Harvard. I don’t suppose any of you went to Harvard, although it is getting to be quite co-educational. We listed seventy-six Harvard professors, each of whom had affiliations with from two to forty Communist-front organizations. Now, that does not automatically damn a person. Some of them were simply naive; some professors don’t know which way is up about things political. Why in the world a professor, who might be the greatest authority in the universe on his subject, automatically becomes a great authority on everything else, is beyond me. A typical example is Harlow Shapley of Harvard, who has been affiliated with some twenty Commu-

nist-front organizations. He is a truly great authority on astronomy, yet he frequently utters all sorts of ukases, edicts and comments on other subjects about which it is obvious he knows absolutely nothing. The mere fact that your favorite professor may be the greatest authority in the country on his particular subject, does not mean that he is the great "I AM" on all subjects. Yet there is something about the dignity of ivy-covered walls that seems to make them think they are, and tends to make other people think so too.

People who join Communist-front organizations, even innocently, are often-times doing more harm than Communist Party members. For instance, I think that Harlow Shapley and Francis Matthiesen (who committed suicide recently) and some of the other prominent professors who join these fronts do far more harm to America than Earl Browder, Eugene Dennis and other leaders of the Communist Party, because, under the guise of humanitarianism, they indoctrinate people with certain facets of Communism. And that is another of the things you have to look out for—activity in Communist-front causes.

(4) *Academic Freedom.* Another indication is that they stand up and shout about "academic freedom," some of them in innocence, some of them knowing of what they speak. The reason they want academic freedom—so-called—is that they can bring about a situation in which you and I and others on our side cannot have freedom of speech.

Why all this talk about *academic* freedom? What is there about the sacred ivy-covered walls that gives a person freedom to do things that he should not be permitted to do? Some of you are mothers. What about parental freedom? What about the right of parents to have their youngsters instructed in principles of Americanism? That is an even greater right than for an academician to have a special freedom to hand out ideas that are un-American.

(5) Another test is by the "economics" they preach. I am not an economist. I am still going to school, by the way. I have just finished some courses under von Mises at New York University, so I am sort of an economist by osmosis. But I tell you that the "economics" those people put out is absolute rubbish. It is not economics at all. It is part of the planned program to get America and the other countries of the world into Statism, and the more they can take away rights from the individual, the faster they can get us into Statism. That is the purpose of a great deal of the so-called "economics" that has been propagated for the last sixteen or eighteen years.

The situation is really very critical, young ladies, and I want you to realize it. If you possibly can see your way clear to do so, I want you to become an expert on *Liberty*. I want you also, if you have nerve enough, to stand up when your professor is saying things that just absolutely are not true and tell him so, and if to do that will flunk you, tell somebody else what he is saying. Write letters to the editor of your school paper, your local paper, your hometown paper—even under an assumed name, if you prefer. Or even better, write us.

G.I.s in college cannot well afford to remonstrate with their professors, because if they get flunked, they lose out on their G.I. Bill of Rights. And don't think there have not been many cases where boys *have* lost out because they have had nerve enough to contradict and argue with some Left-Wing radical professor who is trying to poison the minds of his pupils with un-Americanism. You young ladies are not under a G.I. Bill of Rights, so you can call the professor's hand. And if you feel you cannot do that, write in to ZTA's National Officers and they can forward to it to us. Or you can write directly to the National Council for American Education. We have ways of dealing with those things without causing you any embarrassment or even using your name.

If you would go out from this convention as Apostles of Liberty to do what you can to clean up the situation in the school you attend, it would be the finest thing that could happen in America.

Do not think that "just one person can't do much" in your college. There is an organization that has caused a lot of attention in the last few years called the Christophers. How many of you have heard of it? (A few hands were raised.) It is very largely a Catholic organization but not exclusively so. They have a marvelous motto: "YOU CAN CHANGE THE WORLD!" It is an inspiring idea—that you as an individual can change the world. That is covering a lot of territory, I agree, but I'll tell you unequivocally, that you as an individual *can* do a great deal to clean up the situation in your own school if you will only try. If you will simply write in to our Council and give us the names of professors who are putting out propaganda in your classes that does not sound right or does not sound like good Americanism to you, you will be doing a tremendous favor to your country. In a way it won't be doing any favor to the Council, because all of those letters cause us a lot of work—but we are willing to do that for the sake of this blessed country. Seriously, it would be of tremendous benefit.

Here is our trouble: We have a very complete

record of all the people who have ever belonged to or sponsored any Communist-front organization. There have been over 1800 such Communist-front organizations. This little pamphlet that we put out lists 550 Communist-front organizations that have been officially declared to be subversive by the Attorney General, the Un-American Activities Committee of Congress, or some other official body—550! There are in addition some 1300 others. We have a record of professors who have been affiliated with all of these, but that is not enough. Some of the most vicious professors have not belonged to any Communist-front organization. In some cases they may even have been members, or secret members of the Communist Party. For instance, Earl Browder does not belong to any Communist-front organization, yet for years he ran the Communist Party. So mere non-affiliation in a Communist-front is not conclusive.

We have put out reports on Harvard, Yale, the University of Chicago. The report on the University of Chicago listed 60 professors and percentage-wise it is the worst of all. We issued a report on three California universities, the University of California, Stanford and the California Institute of Technology. Also one on Columbia University, which has the largest number of any—87 members of the Columbia faculty have had affiliations with Communist-front organizations.

How many of you in the room are teachers? (Several hands were raised.) You probably have either gone to school under, or have gone to school under the people who have gone to school under two of the people who are in the Columbia list—George Counts and John Dewey. Those two men, in my opinion, more than any others are responsible for the situation that exists in our schools and colleges today. Many of the students who believed in these men and became indoctrinated with their precepts, today are teachers in normal schools and colleges where teachers are taught. I tell you frankly that their precepts, if carried on, will absolutely ruin the United States of America.

Why is it that the United States today is the greatest and the richest and the most powerful country in the world? It is not because of our natural resources—that helps, but a lot of other countries have greater natural resources than we have. It is not because we are so much smarter than anybody else. We aren't—in every phase of activity we can find peoples who are many times smarter than we are. Even the Chinese can probably give us aces and spades; for thousands of years the educated Chinese have possessed a very high order of intelligence and erudition. The thing that has made us the greatest country on earth is

one thing—*freedom*—because it is the thing which has let us gain and keep the profits that we have made.

Under the Socialist State a person simply does not work. Look at Britain. The individual production of coal was cut in half as soon as they became socialized. Workers, after all, are human beings and it is just human nature not to work unless there is incentive. It is the incentive of gain, of profit—possible only in a free society—which has brought America to its present great state. We have been in existence only 175 years. In that length of time we have had more inventions, 6 to 1, than all the rest of the world put together, because of the incentive system possible only under free enterprise.

Even the Soviets found out several years ago that without incentives—no matter how dire the threat of punishment—people did not work, and now trying to get production they have installed an effective system of incentives. Fear of punishment alone did not get production, even when the punishment for failing to do so was death or internment in the slave labor camps. As you probably know, some 14 or 15 million people are working at slave labor in the Soviet State. Another penalty for not keeping up in Russia was through control of food.

That, by the way, is another of the compulsions the Socialist slave state uses—the withholding of food cards. You may have wondered why countries that have been taken over by the Soviet Union, like Czechoslovakia, whose people have known the taste of freedom, would ever accept Communism. The answer is food cards. The all-powerful State gives ration cards only to those who “cooperate.” Without ration cards they cannot eat and their children cannot eat. That is one of the powers that the totalitarian state has and diabolically uses to keep its victims in line.

Young ladies, this subject of Statism vs. Individualism is the greatest, the most all-important subject in the whole country, and the battle over it is taking place right under your eyes every day of your life.

I cannot expect in a 40-minute speech to sell you my ideas of Individualism, when some professors may have been trying for years to sell you their brand of Totalitarianism. They have been, subtly or openly, preaching totalitarianism, collectivism, socialism to you for years—once, twice, three times a week, one, a few or many professors in each college.

As I said previously, professors’ affiliations—or lack of them—with Communist-front organizations are not conclusive as to whether they are

good Americans or not. Their activity in such organizations is of course an indication, but there are two other indications which are far more accurate. One of these is the material—books or magazine articles they have written. Our Council reviews these to as great an extent as possible, but many professors—some of the worst—have never written a book or magazine article. The surest way to tell is from what they are saying in classes; that is tremendously important, and is where you can be of invaluable assistance. If you would report on what they are saying, and if you would, in addition, dedicate yourselves to being Apostles of true Americanism—freedom of the individual—it would be the greatest thing that could happen to this country. If you as individuals would do that, just this little group—the 400 people in this room—could make over the educational system of this country. I wish you would go away from here to do just that.

What is being taught in *all* the schools is of terrific importance, not only in the colleges, because comparatively few people go to college. Subverters start out at the kindergarten level indoctrinating the youngster. In the upper grades, the indoctrination is carried on intensively. Incidentally, this takes place not just in the political economy or the government classes, but throughout the whole school system. Biology teachers, English teachers, even geology teachers get in some of the most clever indoctrination for the collectivist state that one could think of.

And so I plead with you, earnestly, that you go away from this wonderful convention of yours dedicated to preserving the American heritage, vowing that you will do your best to understand this subject and to preserve America for those who will follow you.

Again I want to say that I am genuinely honored to have been invited here, Madam President. Thank you so much, young ladies, for your courteous attention.

. . . Prolonged applause . . .

NATIONAL PRESIDENT HARRISON: Mr. Zoll, we certainly appreciate your coming here from New York. We know how busy you are but we knew that you had a wonderful message for our members. The subject you have discussed is a problem that our Council has been worried about and has spent a great deal of time on with our members on certain campuses this year.

I wonder if some of the girls have some questions that they would like to ask Mr. Zoll. Do any of you have any questions that you would like to ask at this time?

Question: I wonder if Mr. Zoll could tell us anything about student leadership. You have more or less gone into the background of faculty members, but I think the greatest problem that we have to face at this particular time is student leadership that is Communistic and traveling under the guise of humanitarian projects.

MR. ZOLL: You are quite right; it is through student leaders that a great deal of subversive work is carried on. Sometimes it is just because the young folks who lead those movements are inspired on their own to get out and stir up trouble. But often they are given direction, leadership and financial assistance by the groups in the community that seek to propagandize the students. One such instance occurred at Temple University in Philadelphia. The *Educational Guardian*, our semi-monthly publication carried a story about some things that had taken place at Temple. In this case Temple said they did not have any such group as the one involved.

We investigated. Here is what was happening in Temple, and is perhaps happening in your school: The Communist Party in Philadelphia issues a 12-page mimeographed publication once a month that they put out as being from the Communist Council of Temple University Art School. We found that it was written and printed by the Communist Party of Philadelphia with the name of Temple University Art School on it and was then handed out all around Philadelphia, particularly, in the vicinity of the Art School. Sometimes that is what happens.

Often in colleges the people who lead radical movements are those who cannot get recognition in any other way. They want to be famous, even in some obnoxious manner, so they start a radical club or a radical movement. They stir up fifty times as much trouble as they are entitled to stir up, because they are vociferous and are well organized. A dozen people like this on a campus can stir up more trouble than all the rest of the student body can quiet down, and it gives the student body a very bad name, of course.

But as to our ability to identify on any campus the *persons* who are heading up the various groups, our Council cannot do that, because we are not closely enough in touch with them. But I'll tell you some of the *organizations* that are bad.

The National Student Association is an organization that can be viewed with suspicion on most campuses. The Labor Youth League can be viewed with suspicion on most campuses. The Young Progressives of America and the Student Section of Americans for Democratic Action are some of those suspect ones that are currently in the schools.

If you want us to send you material on these various organizations, we will be glad to do so for the next year without any cost to you. We will send you our publications to help keep you posted currently. If any of you who wish to get this material will put your name and address on a card and leave it in the back of the room, I will see that you get our literature for the next year. I think you will find it informative, and that you will get some material out of it which will help you in the cause to which I hope you will here dedicate yourselves—preserving America.

NATIONAL PRESIDENT HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Zoll. Does anyone else have a question?

Question: I would like to ask who are the members of the National Council for American Education? I mean, who is backing it?

MR. ZOLL: It is not a matter of being “backed”; we are a membership organization. We have several thousand members who I think are the finest, most patriotic people in America. In the literature at the back of the room you will find a list of our officers and governors. We are not backed by any “angels”; I wish we were. I happen to be the biggest “angel” of the Council. This in spite of the fact that as a matter of substantive intelligence I probably should be a Communist, because if everybody would divide up and share equally, I am sure that I would come out with more than I have now.

You doubtless know the story of the lady who had a colored maid who used to be a rabid attender of Communist meetings. The lady did not like her going to those meetings, but she could not very well do anything about it, without abridging the maid’s freedom, so she let her go to them. Finally the maid stopped going and the lady said, “Mandy, why did you stop going to the Communist meetings?” Mandy replied, “They said at one meeting that if everybody would divide up, everybody would have \$350, and I’ve got \$418 now.” (Laughter)

NATIONAL PRESIDENT HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Zoll. If there are no further questions, this will close this part of our program.

Published and Distributed by
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION
 1 MAIDEN LANE, NEW YORK 7, N. Y.

ADDITIONAL COPIES

	Price
1 - 10 copies	15c each
20 “	\$2
100 “	\$7
1000 “	\$45
Special price on larger quantities.	